Do Microbes Cause Disease?

It is almost universally held to-day that all diseases are generated by minute organisms called microbes or bacilli. The germ theory of disease, taught in every text-book of physiology that has come under our notice, holds that the seeds or spores of bacteria, floating in the air we breathe, in the water we drink, or in the food we eat, are taken into our bodies, where they develop, multiply, and, each after its own species, produce evil results.

We have already, in No. 28 of our seventh volume, signalized a growing revolt against this theory; some eminent physicians, especially in England and Germany, asserting that these bacilli or microbes, whose presence is revealed by microscopical investigation, do not cause, but merely convey disease, while others claim that all microbes are beneficent until depraved by evil communications.

A still more radical stand is now taken by an American physician, Professor J. P. Schmitz, M. D., of San Francisco, in a pamphlet recently published, under the title: 'The Microbe-Producing-Disease Theory Inconsistent With the Laws of Nature. How Diseases are Produced. A New Physiological Law Promulgated.'*)

Dr. Schmitz proceeds from the observation that all the microbe-killing of the medical profession for the last thirty years has not perceptibly lessened consumption, typhoid fever, the plague, cholera, lockjaw, smallpox, whooping-cough, pneumonia, scarlatina, measles, diphtheria, or any other disease.

The reason of this failure he finds in this that the theory, that diseases are produced by microbes, is all wrong,—in fact inconsistent with the laws of nature.

The microbe-producing-disease theory, according to Dr. Schmitz,—who, by the way, is not a master of the laws of division—properly involves eleven questions:

1. What is a microbe? 2. Are microbes in the human body in health? 3. If microbes are in the human body, do they cause disease? 4. Do microbes consume material in the human body which the economy requires? 5. Do microbes attack healthy tissues or change normal healthy matter in the human body into

---

*) Published by the Author, 3321 Twenty-First Street, San Francisco, California. Price 50 cents.

(The Review, Vol. IX, No. 28. St. Louis, Mo., July 17, 1902.)

injurious matter? 6. Are microbes simply on account of their presence injurious to the human body? 7. Does abnormal or decomposed matter contain the poison injurious to the human body, without the microbes? 8. Do microbes act as foreign poisonous matter in the human body and thereby cause disease? 9. Can any disease be cured by simply killing the microbes? 10. Why do microbes exist? 11. How are diseases produced?

1. In reply to the first question, Dr. Schmitz defines microbes as "the minutest forms of life, embracing both what is revealed to us by the microscope and what lies beyond the power of our most powerful optical instruments to detect." Without entering upon a discussion of the distinction between animal and vegetable microbes, he proceeds to show that every living vital microbe is and must be an organism.

2. His second thesis is that there are microbes in the most healthy organic body, a statement, we believe, which stands undisputed.

3. In the third chapter he claims that the microbe is not a disease producer. "In each and every disease in which it is claimed that microbes are found and that the disease was caused by them, it can be proved on physiological grounds, that the microbes did not produce it." The duty and function of microbes is simply, after the death of an organism to separate its anatomical and chemical elements, thereby fitting them again for assimilation into other living organisms.

"Infectious diseases are more numerous than other diseases, and, if microbes cause the disease, by what or how do they injure the body? How or by what do they produce the anatomical changes? Why do some patients die and others not? Why are some persons immune against certain diseases and others not? At any rate, in what does the immunity consist? These questions have not been explained or answered, yet the bacteriologist claims that microbes produce diseases."

4. In answer to the fourth question, our Doctor claims that, "If....a natural law exists whereby the microbes must be present wherever organic decomposed matter exists, then it will become clear that the presence of microbes can not mechanically or otherwise injure the body, because that would work against their law."

5. From the fact that bacteriologists have discovered microbes in almost every disease known, which disappear as soon as the vital forces of life are reëstablished, the Professor argues that "microbes do not attack healthy tissues, or change normal healthy matter in the human body," and that they "consequently can not produce disease."

6. In the sixth section he argues that "it is decomposed matter in the body that lies at the seat of the trouble, that is, the abnormal amount and quality of such matter. If that matter was not present, then there would be no microbes present; consequently the simple presence of the microbes is not injurious to the human body."

7. In section seven he proceeds to show that abnormal or decomposed matter contains the poison injurious to the human body. "All infectious diseases depend upon the quantity of the virus, or auto-toxine, not on microbes. Microbes can not grow without a suitable soil; consequently the suitable soil is the first requisite. Impoverishment or an abnormal change of the blood, lymph, or of any decomposed tissue furnish the suitable soil, and if the suitable soil is injected into a healthy individual, it causes disease; and if that suitable soil is derived from a specific disease, it causes that disease."....."Filth is the great breeder of disease. Prevent or remove the filth in and outside of the body, and then we need not fear the microbes."

8. Microbes do not act as foreign poisonous matter in the human body and therefore do not cause disease. Hence,

9. No disease can be cured by simply killing the microbes.

10. Why do microbes exist? "In the most perfect healthy organism (animal and vegetable) waste matter is set free. This waste matter is organic, because it is derived from an organism." .....The Creator "created the microbes in order that all waste matter might be of use again for animal and vegetable organisms." ....."Matter that once formed a part of a vital organism, but is now dead, is by the microbes reduced to its elementary state, thereby fitting such elements again to be used by vital living organisms. This proves that the vital animal and vegetable organism depend on the microbes for the principal natural nutritious elements. On the other hand, it also proves that the microbes depend for their natural existence and functions on decayed animal and vegetable organic matter."

Dr. Schmitz declares that a physiological law exists in regard to the isolation of decayed organic matter by microbes, to-wit: that the vital animal and vegetable body depends on the vital microbes to furnish the natural elements for nutrition from matter that once was vital, and that the microbes depend on animal and vegetable decay.

11. How are diseases produced? As long as the cells perform their normal functions, the body is healthy. If, on the other hand, from one cause or other, poisonous decomposed tissue accumulates, it interferes with these functions and disease ensues. The microbes do not destroy a part or the whole of a vital organism,

because that is not their function, as long as every part of the organism is in a normal, healthy condition; but as soon as any part becomes abnormal, i. e., dead tissue, then the microbes begin their appointed work of decomposition, and we have disease. A cure can only be wrought by the application of a proper antidote to the poisonous dead matter in the organism, so that the cells can go on repairing the broken-down tissue. If this is accomplished, the microbes cease their work and the normal, healthy condition of the organism is restored.

This theory strikes at the foundation of organic chemistry; but it is plausible and deserving of the attention which the arguments on which it bases demand. Dr. Schmitz has developed them more at length in his text-book on physiology.

Two years ago that eminent British practicioner, Dr. G. G. Bancock, was quoted in the *Westminster Review* as stating that he had proved that "the poisons of variola, etc., are not and can not be the product of a bacillus; that Loeffler's bacillus is not a constant, and therefore can not be the essential, element in diphtheria; that the essential element in typhoid is not the bacillus typhosus; that there is no evidence that tuberculosis is due to the tubercle bacillus; that the comma bacillus can not be regarded as the essential element in cholera; that the so-called pathogenic micro-organisms are constantly found under conditions consistent with perfect health, and that in many notable instances they actually exert a beneficent influence. All these things—which are facts, not opinions—go to show that the modern doctrine of bacteriology is a gigantic mistake. It is safe to predict that ere long it will be recognized that all these various bacilli play a beneficent role in the economy of nature."

The belief that microbes actually cause disease has been induced by mistaking an effect for a cause.

Paganism in Protestant Germany

And the "Los von Rom" Movement.

By Rev. Victor Cathrein, S. J.

IV.—[*Conclusion.*]

So far we have only mentioned pastors who pretend at least to have some connection with the religion of the Gospel. Side by side with these there exists a great number of preachers who have openly turned their backs upon Christianity and attack it without fear in their "religious" lectures. In almost every great town of Germany one or more free-religious communities are to be found inimical to all dogmas, yet desirous of religious emotion or edification of some sort. Their preachers often pander to the most superficial indifferentism, holding one religion as good as another—with the exception of positive Christianity. Here is a sample of the stuff to which they treat their congregations.

I have before me a book: 'The Ten Commandments of Moses in Modern Light,' by George Schneider, preacher in Mannheim [Frankfort a. M. 1901]. As stated in the preface it contains lectures given to a free-religious congregation and intends to show that in such congregations "earnest religious endeavor" is not wanting. Preacher Karl Scholl, of Munich, writes a laudatory introduction to Schneider's work, in which he says that it is well adapted to demonstrate the untenableness of the foundations on which rests the Christian church, "in such a way that even to the most ardent believer no choice is left but to give up, once for all, his prejudiced and erroneous views." Science, he says, has proved, long ago, that the Bible is a book written by men, containing, besides a mass of myths and legends, ideas and customs current many centuries ago and suitable only to those bygone times. What refers to morals or ethics is alone of permanent value. Schneider's book will help "to further the great religious historical evolution which the reformation of the XVIth century inaugurated with so much determination, and which is carried on now-a-days by the efforts of the 'Ethical Societies,' the 'Freethinkers' the 'Egidy-Union' and the 'free-religious communities,' and also by men who still remain within the church, but are not afraid of looking farther afield over its walls," e. g., R. Rothe, W. Beyschlag, and others. There are thousands, continues Scholl, who are dissatisfied with the church and search after truth: to these Schneider's book stretches out a helping hand to lead them on to the new faith.

And now for the Mannheim preacher's illustration of the ten

commandments. The Bible, says Schneider, "attributes a divine origin to the law of Moses and surrounds it with a divine halo. We need not say that we have no faith in such an origin. That legislation is too childish to be held up as pure truth to an enlightened age like ours." What is the pure truth? When Moses delivered the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage, he had to give them laws to keep them together. "He cloaked his personal cleverness with divine authority and secured success. It is an old practice still kept up in our own time."

Moses, then, simply deceived the stupid Jews. Being an apostate Egyptian priest, he made the best of his priestcraft. Moses stamps his laws as divine by the expression "Thou shalt," but to us, who have so far advanced, this is of no value. We, "who have occasion to admire every day and every hour the eternal creative art of all-ruling nature in the heavens and on earth, we have no reason to allow our moral life to be influenced by a legendary account of creation." "Let revealed religions and their representatives, who labor and strive for heaven before everything, fetch their laws from heaven: we who labor and strive for nothing but a noble and moral manhood on earth, we shall find in man and man's nature the unchanging laws to which he is subject."

Man used to be composed of body and soul. But Schneider has changed all that. "Man, with all his bodily, spiritual and psychic qualities, is to be conceived as one whole indivisible unit."

Man ought to think, not to believe; he must love his fellow-men and work honestly. "To think, to love, to work: there is the trinity of human duties.....Although no God has imposed them, they are yet divine, for they spring from the god-like nature of man." It is the old story over again: God is cast from his throne and man is placed on it.

Many hold, says our preacher farther, that the literal belief in dogmas such as "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, risen from the dead, ascended into heaven," and all Biblical wonders, are a "massive faith" unsuitable for our times. Schneider tells these Protestants that there is no choice: they must accept or reject all miracles alike, for all rest on the same authority. And he rejects them all. "Science knows nothing of a God revealing himself and saying: I am the Lord, thy God."

This science, always mouthed by the half-cultured,—we know it! Schneider does not vouchsafe us a shred of demonstration: his lambs must take his word for all he pronounces.

Dealing with the second commandment, our author tells us how Prof. O. Pfleiderer in Berlin won him over to pantheism and made him understand the unreasonableness of a personal God, a trinity, etc., etc. Many are they who at the German universities ex-

change the saving faith for a comfortable infidelity! That Schneider should harp on the "adoration of the Virgin," is not to be wondered at in such an enlightened writer!

The Mannheim preacher is opposed to the adoration and invocation of God. "We can not invoke the name of God in our distress, because our consciousness has delivered us from the vain belief that an eternal omnipotence cares for the welfare of individuals."

But enough has been quoted of these blasphemous utterances. Schneider, notwithstanding his book, indignantly repudiates the accusation of being an enemy to religion—only fanatics can prefer such a charge! The explanation lies in the dishonest use of the term religion now fashionable in German non-Catholic circles. The sense of the word is so altered as to be quite changed: instead of denoting a system of faith and morals, it is applied to every moral or immoral code of action.

* * *

This bird's-eye view is sufficient to convince the reader of the sad disintegration of Christianity in Protestant Germany. It would be an easy task to multiply our quotations, but it is unnecessary. Bearing in mind the wide-spread and deep-reaching apostacy exposed in this sketch, we now put the question: Can those German missionaries who invade Austria with the cry "Away from Rome," be animated by purely Christian motives? If not the propagation of the Christian faith, what are their motives? We answer unhesitatingly: political agitation against the Catholic dynasty of Austria. German non-Catholic papers, for instance the *Nationalzeitung*, make no secret of it. As Prussia is the representative of Protestantism, so Austria is still by many Germans looked upon as the representative of Catholicism. To many the cry "Away from Rome" is equivalent to the cry "Away from Austria and the house of Habsburg." There may also exist some spiritual affinity between the Austrian originators of the movement and the members of the Evangelical alliance, for to this latter belong many who are Christians only in name.

In our opinion, however, the favor which the "Away from Rome" movement has found in Germany is chiefly due to its affording an opportunity for silencing, or hushing up the quarrels in the Protestant camp by means of a combined attack on Rome. The intermost vital principle of Protestantism is negation, especially the negation of papal authority, that rock upon which Christ built his Church. Nothing, therefore, is more fit to unite the divided brethren than the war-cry against Rome. The Evangelical Alliance is well aware of this fact. Whenever fierce internal dissensions threaten to upset the whole Evangelical fabric, the war-

cry is raised, the *odium papæ* is fanned into flames, and, for a time, some external unity is restored. At such periods even Protestants who care nothing for their church feel in their hearts an awakening of "the Evangelical conscience" and go forth to battle against the Romans.

Fortunately our Austrian brethren have now entered with great energy upon a war of self-defence, and it is earnestly to be hoped that their sustained effort may be crowned with speedy success. They may adopt as a motto the prophetic words of the great Bishop of Mayence, Emmanuel von Ketteler, pronounced fifty years ago:

"Whilst the world voices 'Los von Rom,' let us cry, with heart and soul, 'United with Rome.' And the more the world is divided and tends to ruin, the more let us rest and rejoice in the thought that we have a centre of unity in the primacy of the Pope."

CONTEMPORARY CHRONICLE.

THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

The Disintegration of Episcopalianism.—A reverend subscriber sends us a clipping from the Milwaukee *Journal* of July 2nd, giving an account of the hot feud between low-church and high-church as exemplified in the case of the Rev. Mr. Lester and Bishop Nicholson. Our correspondent comments thereon as follows:

The real cause of the Rev. Mr. Lester's resigning gives us another glimpse of how indifferentism, liberalism in religion, latitudinarianism, natural offsprings of the great Protestant principle of private judgment, are a kind of preparatory school for infidelity; how the same pernicious and mischievous tenet is not only leading Protestant Germany to Paganism, (as THE REVIEW has pointed out in its interesting series "Paganism in Protestant Germany,") but is also the dangerous microbe which is undermining and ravaging the health of the Prodigal Son of America and gradually preparing him for the wholesale denial of Christianity as a divine revelation, which eventually means paganism.

Involuntarily Bossuet's prediction when speaking of the great revolt of the sixteenth century, is recalled. He says: "Every man erects a tribunal for himself, when he becomes the arbiter of his own belief. Although the innovators wished to restrain the minds of men within the limits of Holy Scripture, yet as each individual was constituted its interpreter, and was to believe that Holy Scripture would reveal to him its meaning, all were authorized to worship their own inventions, to consecrate their own errors, and to place the seal of divinity on their own thoughts. It

was then foreseen that by this unbridled license sects would be multiplied to infinity and men, torn asunder by so many sects, would seek at length a fatal repose and complete independence in indifference to all religion, or Atheism." Thus it would seem that the suggestion of Rev. C. R. Birnbach, of Illinois, to go our "progressive" Catholics one better, by establishing a Protestant Episcopalian order of Paulist Fathers to rear up a new corps of clergy fully equipped for the wider employment (THE REVIEW, No. 16, page 252) would find greater favor if the proposed order would organize for "turning a crank to grind out grace by pretty magic," to save so many Protestants from being swept into the region of the "Unknowable."

"Mediaevalism," declares Rev. Lester; "Unitarianism," retorts Bishop Grafton, whilst Frederick C. Morehouse, publisher of the *Young Churchman*, when asked about the differences between the high and broad-churchmen, replies: "There are practically no differences and there never was a time when the church was so closely united as at present."

THE STAGE.

Ben-Hur, the Novel and the Play.—Mr. Arthur Symons, a poet of rare delicacy and an acknowledged arbiter of taste, writing, a few weeks ago, on the dramatic version of the story now acting in London, says:

"Strictly speaking the book is not written at all. The language is awkward, uncomfortable, like the language of a man who is taking up his pen for the first time. We come constantly on such phrases as: 'The goodness of the reader is again besought in favor of an explanation'; or 'with this plain generalization in mind, all further desirable knowledge on the subject will be obtained by following the incidents of the scene occurring.' A Bacchante in the grove of Daphne, trying to talk poetically, talks after this fashion: 'The winds which blow here are respirations of the gods. Let us give ourselves to the waftage of the winds.'"

No wonder that Mr. Symons makes merry over the childishness of such a style. A writer in the *Athenaeum* says:

"Maugre the wonderful popularity it has obtained in America, 'Ben-Hur,' by General Lew Wallace, is a curious product, which can not appeal to good taste."

The *Providencce Visitor*, which has long contended, that 'Ben-Hur' was mawkish and unsound in sentiment, points out in its No. 30, that this book is in great measure responsible for that alarming growth of irreverence, which can await with equanimity the production of a dramatized version of the Passion staged by Hebrew play-wrights and acted by the ordinary "gentlemen" and "ladies" of the theatrical profession in a public theatre.

The *Athenaeum* reviewer, whom we have quoted, rightly says, that "with the best of intentions, such a book must savor of irreverence, and is not unlikely to incur the charge of profanity." The root of the matter, according to the *Visitor*, lies in this: "Catholics and Protestants approach Our Lord from diametrically opposite standpoints. The Catholic reaches out the arms of his soul to touch Him physically in the Sacraments. He comes close to Him daily in the Mass. His Christ is an ever-present and daily Lord,

his Lord, *our* Lord, always, and not merely *the* Lord, as Protestants call Him. Your average sectarian, on the other hand, views Him as a remote historical personage, about whom it is proper to sentimentalize. That makes all the difference in the world; it is just the difference between Catholicism, which is essentially mystical and living and constructive, and the sects, which are essentially rationalizing and destructive."

LAW.

The Law as a Profession.—Editor H. Gerald Chapin, of the *American Lawyer*, publishes in the June number of *Success* a rather startling article on "The Decline of the Practicing Lawyer." He prophesies that within twenty years, the individual or general practice attorney will be extinct, save only in the remoter country districts. Reduced to a chemical formula, computed on a scale of ten, the sum of legal business, according to Mr. Chapin, may be said to be compounded of the following:

Real estate	3 parts.
Corporations	2 "
Commercial cases and "collections"	2 "
Wills and administration of estates	1 part.
Accident and negligence suits	1 "
Defence of criminals	1 "

In the real estate business, the lawyer has been practically crowded out by the title-insurance companies, who work for less fees and are financially responsible for their errors. The incorporation of corporations is attended to by special companies. The legal departments of trust companies draw up wills. Collection agencies dun recalcitrant debtors upon terms so low that the attorney can not possibly compete. The fidelity and casualty companies by their staffs of able counsel carry to the highest courts of appeal any case which may be brought against those insured. Criminal law in each large city is falling more and more into the hands of a few reputable firms and a few smaller ones, whose rank in the profession is exceedingly low.

Nor has the now thoroughly commercialized legal profession escaped the tendency of the age toward specialization and concentration. According to Mr. Chapin, there are now in New York City about twenty-five law firms which are gradually absorbing all business of any moment. They represent a number of wealthy clients, whose operations, while large, are not sufficiently great to justify them, like railway or life insurance companies, in having a special legal department of their own. Each of these firms is divided into half a dozen departments, in charge of experts in different branches of the profession. The members of the firm receive comparatively large incomes, while the salary of individuals of the working staff ranges from $10 to $25 per week. The lower amount is the average. There are thousands of young men of excellent ability living on that income, who, under the old *regime*, would have become leaders of the bar, instead of insignificant cogwheels of a mighty machine. And this condition is typical of the state of the profession to-day in all of our large cities.

These are gloomy prospects indeed for our young lawyers and

law students. Let us hope that Mr. Chapin has overdrawn the picture and that, while the time of enormous fees is past, the profession will continue to afford to diligent and able practicioners a liberal income. The opportunities are still large in the legal profession. and ability, zeal, earnestness, honesty, and integrity are bound to bring success in this as in every other calling.

EDUCATION.

Herbert Spencer on Education.—Professor William Henry Hudson says in the Preface to his 'Introduction to the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer' (Appleton & Co., New York, 1894) that "his teachings and speculations have been, of all men's, the most influential in directing the intellectual movements of the nineteenth century." The aged philosopher—we will call him by that name by courtesy, for he is not a philosopher in the real sense—has recently published what he believes will be the last book from his fruitful pen. It is entitled 'Facts and Comments' and consists of a series of notes and observations jotted down from time to time by this analytic man. We have already quoted in one of our recent issues, his opinion on vaccination. His position on education will prove equally interesting to our readers.

Mr. Spencer laughs at the theory that if men are taught what is right, they will do right. Intellectual action has no necessary or inevitable connection with moral action. "Were it fully understood," he says, "that the emotions are the masters, and the intellect the servant, it would be seen that little can be done by improving the servant while the master remains unimproved. Improving the servant does but give the masters more power of achieving their ends."

In his chapter upon State Education, he once more condemns "intellectualization in advance of moralization." The State has no right to impose its culture on the citizen. The State should not take by taxes the earnings of A to pay for teaching the children of B. His theorem, which he demonstrates, is that society is not benefited but injured by artificially increasing intelligence without regard to character. He points to the press as proof of the evil of a forced intellectual culture. To the same cause he attributes the spread of anarchism. He would give supply and demand free play in the intellectual as in the economic sphere. He believes that in education, as in other things, the natural course is best and that course is evolutionary. He would have education unhampered as to superior persons; the poor to get education as best they may.

Education, according to Spencer, "increases the power which the emotions have of manifesting themselves and obtaining their satisfactions—intensifies the emotional life." But in average human beings the lower emotions are more powerful than the higher, and "hence education, adding to the force of all the emotions, increases the relative predominance of the lower, and the restraints which the higher impose, are more apt to be broken through." He would neither have the State aid nor prevent education, but adopt a passive policy.

The Catholic position, as our readers know, is not, like the Spencerian, "*laisser faire;*" nor, on the other hand is it "*faire faire.*" It is "*aider faire.*"

MISCELLANY.

Outcroppings of "Americanism."—The *Catholic Citizen* of Milwaukee continues to furnish material for this rubric. In its edition of June 28th it suggests that this petition be added to the Litany:

"From the methods of Italian diplomacy in the regulation and protection of the interests and liberties of the Church under the American flag, Good Lord deliver us!"

In an editorial article on "Leo's Latest Letter" (the papal note of thanks in reply to the jubilee greeting of the American hierarchy) the *Citizen* (we quote the article from its St. Paul edition, yclept *Northwestern Chronicle* No. 30) insinuates that this letter contradicts and revokes the doctrinal Brief "Testem benevolentiae"!!

The inspiration of this article is to be traced to a long letter in the N. Y. *Sun* (June 1st) by the Rev. Thomas Stanislaus Dolan, of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, which the *Catholic Telegraph* (June 12th) summarized as follows:

Thomas Stanislaus Dolan "leans distinctly in the direction of reform. Could he have his way, the religious orders soon would go out of existence. He even knows the Pope's mind better than the same is known to Leo XIII. himself. He knows, and has actually told the world through the columns of the *Sun*, that the Pope was humbugged into writing his famous letter on 'Americanism' three years ago. He also knows that, now better informed with regard to things American, Leo XIII. has recently taken back all his statements in a letter to the bishops of America."

The spirit of the Rev. Dolan's letter was characterized by "Catholicus Neo-Caesariensis" in the *Sun* of June 8th as "Jansenistic," "un-Catholic," aye "anti-Catholic."

This is strong language, but not exaggerated. Note the way the Washington curate writes of the Vicar of Christ. "The Pontiff," he assures us, "issued his letter on Americanism because he felt profoundly convinced of its expediency. This conviction was the result of information which he regarded as trustworthy, because proceeding presumably from reliable sources." In plain English, his Holiness did not know what he was talking or writing about. He continues: "The Pope's present information is not furnished from the viewpoint of narrow partisanship." "The late Papal letter indicates most clearly that now we are thoroughly understood by the Father of the Universal Church."

It would seem from Rev. Dolan's letter, that those at whom the papal condemnation was aimed, manifested such a marvellous and peculiar humility that they at once betook themselves to Rome and in the spirit of the same humility informed the Pope that he blundered most grievously, and that such a thing as Americanism never existed except in the imagination of a few ultra-conservative reactionary spirits; and that the Pope at last found opportunity to take it all back.

We shall conclude this unpleasant chapter on the eruption of Stanislaus with these words from a letter of Dr. John M. Reiner, Professor in the Augustinian College of Villanova, to the *Sun* (June 8th):

"While Father Dolan's letter is full of confusion, one thing is quite clear, and that is that one species of Americanism will be

condemned by serious-minded people—that mania and irresistible attack of the summer malady, to write without information, to write without attaching any value to either words or principles, and to discuss such questions in the press, in one of the brightest papers in America, in such a flippant way."

Maestro Perosi on the Revival of Church Music in Italy.—The Director of the Sistine Chapel at the Vatican, Don Lorenzo Perosi, a young priest whose oratories have placed him in the front rank of living composers, contributes to No. 2795 of the N. Y. *Independent* an interesting paper on Sacred Music in Italy. He frankly admits that church music in Italy at present is "in a most ungratifying condition," that Italian churches, particularly in the South, "use music which the greater part of the time is absolutely unfitting." But there is a hopeful revival, dating from 1877, when P. Amelli, O. S. B., began to raise aloft in Italy the flag of "Cecilianismo."

It is unfortunately true, and we are glad Don Perosi does not disguise the fact, that Rome, whence have issued the best decrees regarding sacred music, has remained backward in executing them herself. He attributes it, first, to the enormous number of functions held there, with the consequent impossibility of having good music at all of them; second, to the habit the people have of attending church, not to assist at divine service, but to hear a popular concert gratis. Don Perosi hopes much from the work of the commission recently appointed by the Pope for the reform of Church music. He sums up his paper by declaring that there will be no thorough reform of sacred music in Italy, until there be—

"1st. Young men of musical capacity who will devote themselves with enthusiasm and sacrifice to the noble cause of sacred music;

"2d. The salaries of the masters of chapels raised to a minimum on which it is possible to live, many expenses in illuminations and decorations being suppressed;

"3d. A reduction in the number of services so that it will not be necessary to sing three masses in one morning, as in the Giulia Chapel at the Vatican;

"4th. No more insistence on the giving of bad music. the choice being left to the maestro into whose hands the chapel has been intrusted."

The young Maestro concludes thus: "I believe that, little by little, the consciousness of many superiors in the churches who now oppose the movement is awakening, and if we keep to the wise dispositions of the highest authority we shall have no more cause to turn red with shame when we enter and assist at a function in our churches, whether at Rome or at the extreme limits of Italy."

As our readers are aware, this is precisely the position we have taken with regard to the reform of Church music in this country.

[We hope, by the way, that if the *Independent* ever receives another contribution in Italian, it will entrust the translation of it into English to more competent hands. And Don Perosi ought to know that there are *Catholic* journals in America wherein he can discuss these things more profitably.]

NOTE-BOOK.

We are pained to be compelled to chronicle the rather sudden death, on last Saturday, of the venerable Archbishop Feehan of Chicago, under whose benign crozier THE REVIEW was founded and prospered for over three years, despite the attempts of its enemies to move him to muzzle it. The departed Metropolitan, in the words of his and our friend, Father G. D. Heldmann, "had that special gift which won him the absolute confidence and the deepest love and affection of every nationality of his Diocese. He possessed that subtle spiritual power which united them all in himself. He was the kindest of a father to his priests. The poor and downtrodden found in him a kind and compassionate friend at all times. No one in trouble ever went to him but came away blessed by his words and helped to bear their sorrows."..... "Under his hand the parochial school system of Chicago has been so perfected that it is second to none in the world. There are more children in the parochial schools of the Archdiocese than in any other in the United States. Not in vain was he called the 'Defender of the Schools.'"

May he rest in peace!

While the better class of Catholic weeklies are doing everything in their power to combat the "yellow" press and to counteract its evil influence, some of the "boiler-plate abominations soused in holy water" brazenly advertise the most vicious exponents of the "new journalism." Witness this editorial note from the Memphis *Catholic Journal* (June 28th):

"The *Chicago American*, one of the brightest papers in this country, built up its mighty prestige on reliable news and editorials which could not be questioned. There is no other way known to successful journalism."

Thus does a soi-disant Catholic newspaper prostitute itself and disgrace the entire Catholic press—all for a gratis copy of the shameless Chicago rag, we presume, for there is no other motive apparent.

A labor-union church, with the rich excluded, is the latest proposal of organized labor in Indiana, according to the N. Y. *Evening Post* of June 21st. The project is an interesting departure from the Biblical ideal of the rich and poor meeting together before the Lord, who is the maker of them all. With a membership limited to those in good and regular standing in trades-unions, and with the running expenses paid by "assessments"—as if for a strike—the success of the new evangelical venture would seem to be assured. We presume there would be a stringent rule against long sermons; twenty minutes, with a leaning to the side of mercy, was Mr. Evarts' idea, and a labor-union congregation would have peculiar advantages in enforcing it. They could rattle their pew-doors, or all get up and go out, on the stroke of the clock, just as they drop their hammers on week-days. The

pastor, we fear, would find himself somewhat limited in point of Scriptural texts—many of them he would obviously have to avoid.

We have lengthy statements from the Maple Leaf Mining and Development Co., of San Francisco, and their Chicago agents, with regard to the note we lately reprinted from the *Monitor*. We have not room for the letters, but in justice to the company will chronicle the fact that the *Monitor* has since declared, in its edition of June 30th, that the present officers of the company are "responsible and estimable gentlemen." We are glad to see that both the president and the managing director of the concern repudiate the advertising methods resorted to by the Chicago brokers in whose hands was placed the sale of a limited number of shares of treasury stock.

We do not wish to injure the Maple Leaf Mining and Development Company, especially now that we have the promise of its President that "the Board of Directors will not tolerate the use of the name of the Church or any of its clergy for the purpose of encouraging the sale of stock or for any other purpose." But we repeat what was said in the *Monitor* article reproduced by us in our No. 24: "The Maple Leaf Mining Company should stand on the same level as ordinary business enterprises and should be judged by the same rules, neither more harshly nor more leniently. Our readers will make no mistake in investing in this mining venture or in any other mining venture if, before taking stock, they make a personal investigation of the properties in question under the guidance of a reliable and competent mining expert employed by themselves."

While it appears that the new French Premier, Combes, was never ordained a priest, there is no doubt that for a number of years he wore the cassock and was called Abbé. He was a collaborator of Père d'Alzon, the founder of the Assumptionists, and taught at the College of the Fathers at Nîmes, where he distinguished himself by piety, unction, modest bearing, and great severity. *M.* de Bernis, a former deputy of Gard, relates that when he was a student at Nîmes, he was once severely reprimanded by the Abbé Combes for laughing during prayer. We have no details regarding his apostasy, but the Catholic papers say he is a Freemason, and he certainly shows by his demeanor that he hates and means to persecute the Catholic religion.

We are enabled to state to-day, on the very best authority, despite the denial of the Washington correspondent of the *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3597), that the account which we reprinted from the N. Y. *Tribune*, of how Archbishop Gibbons became a cardinal, (see our No. 24) was substantially correct.

Archbishop Corrigan in 1886 was offered the red hat, but refused to accept it because he had no ambition and feared it might give rise to jealousy; he advised that the dignity be conferred

either upon Msgr. Williams, or on Msgr. Gibbons on account of his being primate.

We are also enabled to state that the position of Apostolic Delegate had been offered to Archbishop Corrigan before it was given to Msgr., now Cardinal, Satolli.

It is not true, however, as stated in the *Tribune* article from which we quoted some extracts (this particular one was not among them), that Archbishop Corrigan suggested the name of Msgr. Keane for Dubuque, though the question of this appointment had been virtually referred by Rome to him, and he approved, because Rome, for reasons we may divulge later, wished it.

According to the Boston *Republic* (July 5th) Archbishop Williams has twice refused an honorary degree by Harvard College; and this more than a dozen years ago, before Yale, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and other Protestant institutions became so liberal in offering honorary LL. D.'s to Catholic prelates. We think his Grace of Boston, in acting thus, displayed good sense and prudence.

We are indebted to Mr. Joseph Schaefer, publisher, 9 Barclay Street, New York City, for a colored print of the late Archbishop Corrigan. It is the portrait which was first issued officially for the benefit of the New York diocesan seminary. Size of print, 16 by 20; size of paper, 22 by 26; price fifty cents.

The report of a miraculous apparition at Morne Rouge shortly previous to the terrible catastrophe that destroyed St. Pierre, is confirmed by a correspondent of the Paris *Croix*. According to his account, however, the nuns did not see the Savior, but the image of his Sacred Heart in the ostensorium.

In the *Revue du Monde Invisible* for April, P. Poulain denies that any case of true natural ecstasy has yet been authenticated.

Perhaps no word of recent invention has played so large a part in public discussions as "agnostic." R. H. Hutton, the late editor of the *Spectator*, believed that it was first used by Huxley in 1869 at a party at James Knowles's house; and that Huxley took it from the Biblical reference to the altar to an unknown God. In this sense it would merely be a recognition of what Huxley held to be the limits of human knowledge. A recent contributor to the *Spectator*, however, calls attention to a decisive passage in Huxley's 'Collected Essays,' vol. v., p. 239. "It came into my head," Huxley writes, "as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant." The name which he coined for himself was, then, not merely descriptive, but aggressive, implying a contempt of all mysticism and of revealed religion in general.